HUMAN EVENTS SUBSCRIPTION RATES GO UP JULY 1

Extend your subscription at present low rates.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

See Page 4.

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 23 June 9, 1960 Section 1 — News

DEMOCRATS: *Johnson vs. Reuther* ..... (page 1)

PRIMARIES: *Demand for probe grows* .... (page 1)

REDS: *Softening up the "liberals"* ..... (page 2)

DULLES: *USSR attacks his war record* (page 3)

NORTH DAKOTA: *Burdick's outside help* (page 4)

Summit at Los Angeles: As the pros in Washington view it—the battle for the Presidential nomination as well as control of the Democratic party is shaping up into a struggle between tall Texan Lyndon Johnson and Walter Reuther, who has long possessed a veto power on the Democratic Presidential nomination. The crisis will come at the party's national convention in Los Angeles, opening July 11.

Senator Johnson's chances have been rated as rising sharply in the past fortnight, as he maintained his "stand by Ike against Khrushchev" position, while the other hopefuls (Stevenson, Kennedy, Symington) have taken the path of "appease Russia." Adlai has been getting deeper into hot water. The French news correspondent who had drawn frank admission of "appeasement" from the Illinoisan has begun to talk and tell more details of the indiscreet interview which Stevenson gave him. Kennedy's stance has appeared similar to Adlai's, and the popular mind sees it as, "Ike should have apologized to Khrushchev." Symington trails along as usual, in a pint-size version of Adlai and Jack.

The tall Texan took the first step towards nomination with full-page newspaper ads, to which many prominent Democrats affixed their names as sponsors. Washington noted a number of Truman friends, such as India Edwards (who worked under Truman when he was President), among them. Washington concludes that the man from Independence will soon switch to Johnson. And Lyndon is gathering delegates, many of them through pressure from his friend Speaker Rayburn.

Significantly, there come excited reports from the Democratic grass roots that Kennedy seems likely to lose many Catholic votes, which will now go to the anti-appeasement Johnson. "Kennedy's criticism of Ike has been the first serious mistake he has made in the campaign," remarked a prominent Democratic politico in New England.

But what of Reuther? Reports for some weeks have indicated he favors Kennedy. It is significant that last week, Governor "Soapy" Williams of Michigan, regarded as Reuther's henchman, came out for the Massachusetts man. However, the UAW boss reportedly will make no formal public choice until the convention opens. Since Reuther is believed to control about 400 votes, he thus controls Kennedy and now has become the center of anti-Johnson forces, for he has never favored the Texan for the Presidential nomination.

All signs point to a Summit among Democrats at Los Angeles that may rival the recent diplomatic Donnybrook in Paris.

Election Probe: Senator Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.) has demanded that the Senate investigate Kennedy's spending in the Democratic primaries. Previously, only Republicans had voiced this request. But, as we go to press, it is expected that other Democrats, possibly from the South and perhaps including Senator Lausche of Ohio, will join the chorus.

Close friends of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson believe that he cannot resist such demands. If he accedes, the country will have a chance to watch a show such as has not been seen since 1920. In that year, Western Republicans and Democrats staged an investigation which revealed delegate buying and excessive spending by Republican candidates Leonard Wood and Frank Lowden, and the expose caused the GOP convention to turn down those two front-runners.

Capitol Hill reports that Morse (defeated by Kennedy in his own state of Oregon) has fire in his eye. Certainly, his statements suggest this. Morse last week asserted: "The American people should make clear to Senator Kennedy that the White House will never be put up for sale." Morse described as "gross misrepresentations" and "unadulterated falsehoods" Kennedy claims of very modest primary spending.

Republicans add fuel to the fire. Representative Miller of New York, chairman of the GOP Congressional Campaign Committee, cracked that the New England Senator was "attempting to turn the White House into the house that Jack bought . . . . The American people will resent this Senator's obvious efforts to buy the one residence in this country which isn't for sale to the highest bidder."

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS • In Three Sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Press notice of the spending spree in the Mountain State's primary has widened since HUMAN EVENTS reprinted the first expose by the Baltimore *Sun* two weeks ago. The Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers has run a week's series of articles. Their reporter on the ground, Dickson Preston, wrote: "West Virginia is buzzing with charges that Senator Kennedy's amazing primary election victory here was achieved at least partly by his big contributions to cash-hungry local party organizations. There are claims—but no proof—that some of the local machines spent a portion of the contributions to buy votes for their own candidates."

Bob Mellace, political columnist for the Charleston (W. Va.) *Daily Mail* estimated the Kennedy forces spent more than $500,000 and wrote: "During his primary campaign here, Senator Kennedy liked to tell a little joke. He said word reached his wealthy father that he, John, was using Poppa's money to buy votes. Poppa Kennedy said he didn't mind paying for a few, but he couldn't afford a landslide. A landslide is what he got in West Virginia."

Mellace goes on to say that West Virginia pros "believe it would have been a very close race [with Humphrey] and Kennedy, knowing it from his own pollsters, wasn't taking any more chances than he had to take. He took the rubber band off his bank roll. Or maybe it was Poppa's."

Now it is reported that another newspaper chain, of a conservative Republican complexion, is sending reporters to West Virginia.

The situation is growing more and more interesting. Grand juries in various areas, including Charleston, are holding investigations. In some places, angry voters have appealed to the US Department of Justice, and that agency is looking into the primary. Additionally, Vice President Nixon is making a personal investigation. On the other hand, the extreme "liberal" Washington *Post* has run a piece by one of its reporters who toured the state, minimizing the charges against Kennedy. Many on Capitol Hill consider this *Post* story a "whitewash."

Amid the charges and counter charges, members of Congress say the only proper way to sift them is to hold a congressional investigation, equipped with the power to subpoena, to ask questions under oath and to go through the books of the candidates. Hence Capitol Hill is waiting to see if Senate Majority Leader Johnson means business and will grant the irate Senator Morse the probe that he has been demanding.

Along Diplomatic Row: Foreign diplomats express surprise at the jittery comments of many US pundits on the announcement of Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky that he had ordered rocket strikes at the air bases from which any plane takes off and "violates" the air space above the Soviet Union. These foreign observers assess the Malinovsky threat as so much bluster.

Since the US is pledged to come to the aid of any of our allies on the periphery of the Soviet Union, instant retaliation by the SAC from America would follow and a global war would start. Such an outcome the Soviet Union obviously would not want, especially since our SAC bombers—as the high-flying U-2 incident proved—can fly well over any Soviet anti-aircraft range.

Additionally, Malinovsky's bluster makes little sense to Diplomatic Row. The U-2 planes have been flying over Soviet territory for years and this has been known to the Soviet High Command; yet the Soviet has never, until last month, sought to bring them down; and that happened—according to all accounts—because motor trouble forced Captain Powers' plane to descend to a much lower altitude.

The reason for the roar from Malinovsky—say these foreign observers—is less military than political. It is one of Khrushchev's first attempts to stir up our "soft under-belly" of jittery "liberals," and to provide political support for Khrushchev's favorite Presidential candidate, Adlai Stevenson (and/or Kennedy or Symington). Stevenson, Kennedy and Symington have made sufficient appeasement gestures since the late crisis to qualify them for the Soviet leader's support. Lyndon Johnson, because of his support of Ike, does not measure up to these specifications.

Any one of the above trio apparently can be counted upon to wage what amounts to a "peace at any price" campaign next fall. Johnson, with his stand-firm-against-Russia attitude, would probably take a line similar to Nixon who has long been under the Soviet leader's displeasure. The intervention of Khrushchev in the American Presidential election, conclude foreign observers, has just begun.

Capitol Camera: When the 400,000-member Amalgamated Clothing Workers met in convention last week, it announced it would support only "real liberals" for office this year, then proceeded to endorse Nelson Rockefeller for President.

• Washington looks for a stepped-up Rockefeller drive should Nixon show poorly in this week's California primary.

• Reportedly the 16 California Democratic Representatives will support Lyndon Johnson at the convention because of political debts owed to House Speaker Sam Rayburn.

• One of Castro's newspapers suggests Britain's Field Marshal Montgomery—because of his recent anti-US statements—should become a public relations man for Cuba.

• Adlai Stevenson's Presidential stock rose last week when Alicia Patterson announced that her *Newsday*, a Long Island daily acclaimed by "liberals," will back the portly appeaser for a third nomination.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

• British press mogul Lord Beaverbrook editorially scored US Ambassador "Jock" Whitney after Whitney's New York *Herald Tribune* London bureau chief, Don Cook, strongly downgraded Macmillan in a post-Summit dispatch (reported in HUMAN EVENTS last week).

• News of Red China's "progress"—official figures here show that the production of soy beans during '59 was 15 per cent lower than before the war. Meanwhile, production in the capitalistic US has risen by nearly one-third.

• President Eisenhower has increased pressure on national notables in favor of his big foreign aid program. He's been writing personal "first name" letters, "Dear Jack" (etc.), urging pressure on members of Congress for his favorite measure.

• Western Europe reaction to the U-2 imbroglio is actually something different than described by Democratic probers. Advices from Paris say people there criticized Ike mainly because he confessed to using the intelligence plane—not because he sent it over Russia at the time of the Summit.

• *Diplomatic Row worries about Soviet aggression in Asia—not in Europe. Fear is expressed that the Korean Army is disintegrating (following the State Department's intervention against Syngman Rhee), opening the way for Soviet intervention; and there is apprehension about Red build-up against Viet Nam and Laos, in Southeast Asia.*

• Industrialist Cyrus Eaton, speaking from Communist Hungary and fresh from a tete-a-tete with Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Paris, now says he wants a Democratic President and the abolition of Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America.

• No doubt about it, say politicos, Khrushchev is fond of the Democratic party. Not only does he want a Democratic President, but he feels that Averell Harriman, who still defends Yalta, should replace Allen Dulles as CIA chief.

• The tempo of the North Dakota Senate battle between Republican John Davis and Democrat Quentin Burdick is being stepped up. Vic Johnston, GOP trouble-shooter, has headquarters in the Hotel Gardner, Fargo, N. D., and welcomes help for Davis.

Midas: Styles Bridges, senior Republican of the Senate, voiced the sentiments of many of his party, when on the Senate floor he expressed impatience with too much publicity given to our missile failures, and too little to our accomplishments. He was referring to the successful launching of the 2½-ton Midas earth satellite to test a spy-in-the-sky system for detecting hostile missiles within seconds after they are fired.

"The minute a missile which is fired from Cape Canaveral fails, the information is hurled all over the country and all over the world," said the Senator. "The Russians advertise only their successes, and conceal their failures . . . . I think it is time to talk about some of the American successes. One of our successes was the 9,000 mile shot of the Atlas missile the other day. Today, Midas II, a step of which all Americans can be proud, is another of our great successes."

Additionally, congressional mail from constituents expresses exultant admiration of the remarkable feat of aerial photography, revealed when the U-2 incident broke. Subsequently, the Government released a photograph of San Diego harbor, taken from a height of 70,000 feet with minute details of the harbor plainly visible. Congressmen believe that, if a popular opinion poll were taken on the question—shall U-2 flights continue—the affirmative would win by a vast majority.

Dixie: Despite "liberal" bossism and intensive COPE pressures, the Southern revolt continues. On the heels of the States Righters' victory in the Florida gubernatorial primary, the Dixiecrats made a stubborn showing in the election, last week, of Alabama's slate of Democratic delegates to the electoral college.

Although the Governor, the US Senators and most of the Congressmen threw in their weight on the side of the Loyalist electors, the outcome showed—six Loyalists, five States Righters finally elected. In a state where union boss power is strong, COPE reportedly worked strenuously; on the other hand, local States Righters got no outside support either from other Southern states or from conservatives in the North.

In North Carolina, States Righter I. Beverly Lake ran a strong second in that state's Democratic gubernatorial primary and will face a "moderate" in a June 25 runoff. In Louisiana, Dixiecrat elements helped to deny Camille Gravel (endorsed by National Chairman Paul Butler) the post of national committeeman. The State Committee unanimously threw out Gravel.

Allen Dulles: The Kremlin last week added fuel to the probe into the U-2 affair and the CIA's role therein. The Soviet Government newspaper *Izvestia* charged that CIA chief Allen Dulles was a World War II "accomplice" of Nazi Gestapo chief Himmler, that he had met secretly with envoys of Hitler and Himmler. "There was a plot to break the anti-Hitlerite coalition and to introduce separate negotiations between Germany and the Western Powers," said *Izvestia,* adding, "this helps to understand the role Dulles is playing today."

Capitol Hill rallies to Dulles' side at this false allegation against the man who, during the war, performed a particularly good job in the American OSS intelligence service. What the Kremlin is attacking, say informed sources, is Dulles' attempt in 1943-44 to alert FDR to the possibility of dealing with the German anti-Hitler generals. All this was dealt with by Allen Dulles in his book *Germany's*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Underground (1947). He kept in close touch with the Underground and so reported to the White House, but got no cooperation from Roosevelt and aides.

What the Russians want to keep concealed is that they had been trying to make a separate peace with Hitler in 1943; they would let the Fuerher keep Europe up to the Curzon Line, while Germany would recognize a Soviet take-over in the Far East and Middle East. The Nazi and Red negotiators reached a stumbling block on the disposition of the Dardanelles, with Moscow demanding the north shore of the Turkish strait and Berlin rigidly opposing it.

Many on Capitol Hill blame Dulles, not for any personal lack of zeal against communism, but for his failure as an administrator. He has failed to clean house of a number of "strange characters," "liberals," etc., who have remained to hamper the policies he would like to pursue. Senators place the blame for much of our failure to deal with the Communist network in Latin America—especially in Cuba—on this element in CIA.

North Dakota: Indications multiply that the "liberals" are going all out for Representative Quentin Burdick in his campaign against GOP Governor John Davis for the late Senator Langer's seat in a special June 28 election. Dakota sources estimate that Walter Reuther's COPE may spend up to $200,000 to beat Davis.

Burdick was a special guest at former New York Governor Averell Harriman's Manhattan town house May 10 when Harriman invited a group of rich "liberals" to meet Burdick and contribute to his campaign. Burdick has told North Dakota voters he wants no "outside help."

In a letter to those invited to the Manhattan meeting with Burdick, Harriman wrote: "This election of a liberal internationalist Democratic Senator from what was formerly an arch Republican and isolationist state is going to strike with telling force on the eve of the national conventions. Its effect will be felt all over the country."

Capitol Hill is hardly surprised over the fondness of extreme "liberals" for Burdick. It is pointed out that, not only is Burdick's House voting record 100 per cent pro-ADA on key issues, but that he was a member of the platform committee of the superleftist Progressive party convention when that group ran Henry Wallace for President in 1948. Head of that platform committee was Lee Pressman, who later admitted he had been a Communist.

Labor Front: The National Labor Relations Board has issued instructions to its field forces to try to halt violence in labor disputes. "Force and violence should have no place in labor-management relations," said NLRB Counsel Stuart Rothman. The directions sent to field offices include giving full cooperation to state and local authorities in situations in which violence arises; withholding the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act from those who engage in violent conduct if this would thereby effectuate the purposes of the act, etc.

This statement is welcomed as pinpointing the importance of restraining violence in labor disputes. However, observers of labor affairs doubt that it will accomplish its purpose. While conservatives sit on the Labor Board, the bulk of the field forces are New Deal holdovers with little sympathy for any moves which the labor bosses would dislike. Unfortunately, in this agency, as in others, no general cleaning out of "holdovers" had been attempted since the Truman Administration departed in 1953.

Nuclear Policy: Senator Thomas Dodd (D.-Conn.) reveals that "there exists in fact a serious Communist infiltration in the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy," which held a rally recently in New York's Madison Square Garden.

The rally called for suspension of atomic testing and another Summit conference. Co-chairmen of the event included Walter Reuther, G. Mennen Williams, Eleanor Roosevelt and Norman Cousins. Committee head Cousins was told by Dodd that there was Communist infiltration of the rally organization and Cousins corrected the situation. But Dodd added: "To me it is appalling that the Communists should be able to infiltrate and manipulate" SANE.

The *Worker*, reporting the affair, said that former Sarah Lawrence College president Harold Taylor drew a volley of boos when he said "Let us ignore Khrushchev's shouting, blustering and buffoonery," and that "the boos exploded with still louder force" when Taylor lauded Ike's Summit conduct. According to the *Worker*, Adlai Stevenson "drew top cheers" when his wire to the rally was read. The rally was followed by a peace march to the UN—in other words, the gang walked Eleanor home.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE INCREASE

HUMAN EVENTS subscription rates go up July 1. You may EXTEND your subscription at present LOW rates—if you act NOW. Fill out this coupon:

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S. E., Washington 3, D. C.
Please EXTEND my subscription for the period marked.

CHECK SERVICE DESIRED	Rate July 1	Renew NOW at	
☐ 1 year subscription	$12.50	$11.00	Saving you $ 1.50
☐ 2 year subscription	25.00	17.00	Saving you 8.00
☐ 3 year subscription	37.50	23.00	Saving you 14.50
☐ 4 year subscription	50.00	29.00	Saving you 21.00
☐ 5 year subscription	62.50	33.00	Saving you 29.50

☐ Remittance enclosed ☐ Bill me ☐ Bill my company

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors
JOHN R. BENEDICT NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Part I: Con Man In the White House?

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By JAMES WISCOTT

ALEXANDER NORMAN, a distinguished lawyer, was the Elder Statesman in the Liberal Candidate's entourage. He reluctantly joined the campaign staff at the insistence of the Candidate's father for whom, over 30 years, he had handled many confidential negotiations. His old friend said to him: "Alex, my son is going to run for the Presidential nomination. I'm pleading with you to join his staff. Most of his aides are from 25 to 40 years old. They are impulsive. I'd like to have you sit in on the conferences and keep them out of trouble."

Until this experience, all that Norman knew of politics was "what he read in the newspapers." Actual contact with political reality turned out to be so disturbing that he got relief only by describing his reactions to Albert, his brother and law partner. His "Letters to Albert" follow.

Letter No. 1

DEAR ALBERT: I've been on this new job for two months. I should never have let the Old Man talk me into this. I've never paid much attention to politics—thinking one politician is as bad as another and you can't do anything about it anyway.

In my innocence, I thought Our Candidate was a sincere idealist who lay awake nights trying to think of ways to help the people. I haven't had as much contact with Our Candidate as his father expected—most of the time he's shaking hands at supermarkets and factory gates—but I have learned something about his "inner circle." They do lie awake nights, but to think of ways to rob Peter to pay Paul. They are after the votes of all the "Pauls" and they take for granted that the "Peters" are either too brainwashed to understand what is happening to them or too punch-drunk to care.

Politics—the kind I've been exposed to the last three months—seems to be a confidence game.

A confidence man, says the dictionary, gains the confidence of his victim for the purpose of swindling him. In the most spectacular operations the victim is carefully selected. He is a respectable citizen with larceny in his heart. The crook tells the prospective victim how the two of them can get rich at the expense of the third party. But sometimes it's the partner-in-crime who thought he was going to get something for nothing, who turns out to be the sucker. He ends up paying something and getting nothing.

For the record, Albert, I'd like to say that my Candidate is no worse than some of the others. For all I know, he'd like to be honest; but he's in this too deep. Now he has no choice. Furthermore, he wants the office so badly that he won't let a few pricks of his conscience stop him.

Maybe I shouldn't be writing these things, but I've got to get them off my chest.

Yours, Alex

Letter No. 2

DEAR ALBERT: Thanks for your note of understanding. I don't know how long I'll be able to hold out on this job. I tried to resign, but I'm handling details that can't be transferred overnight to anybody else. So I've got to stay a little longer.

My kindergarten education in this confidence game began when our plane stopped in Cosmic Valley. While Our Candidate was downtown shaking hands, the state chairman got Pat O'Connell—he's our Campaign Manager—into a hotel room to receive a committee of local businessmen. The Cosmic Valley spokesman said:

"Cosmic Valley is a wild scrubland area—not good for anybody the way it is. The business interests here want the Federal government to make it a national park. Then Cosmic Valley will become a major tourist attraction."

Even I, the political novice, could spot instantly what the visitors wanted: all the expenses of developing and maintaining a national park to be paid by Uncle Sam; all the profits to go to local people: hotels, motels, sightseeing companies, souvenir stores, roadside stands, gasoline stations, garages, etc. Naively, I asked why the state or community shouldn't do the developing. The spokesman replied that the Cosmic Valley Chamber of Commerce had already asked the Governor to make it a state park. The Governor told the Committee that taxpayers in his state just don't want to pay any more taxes. He said, "Go to Washington. Get Uncle Sam to make it a national park."

O'Connell sensed that I was about to argue against the proposal, so he jumped up to say that Our Candidate is all for the conservation of natural beauty; he favors more national parks. He promised the visitors they would get what they wanted.

I learned the rest of the story yesterday from O'Connell's assistant, Tom Wiley. Wiley, after he takes a couple of drinks, likes to prove that he's an insider. He told me that after the official meeting—the one I attended—O'Connell got the Cosmic Valley spokesman off to one side. He whispered that many other regions had equal national park possibilities. Cosmic Valley has been a conservative stronghold, and it is now asking for favors from Our Candidate who is an extreme liberal. The way to get something from Our Candi-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

date is to do something for him. Make sure that Cosmic Valley gives him a big vote in the approaching Presidential primary.

For the first time—Wiley spelling it out for me—I saw the con game angle.

Our Candidate's voting record in Congress is 100 per cent liberal. He has voted for every Welfare State Big Spending program ever to come before Congress. He voted against the Taft-Hartley bill. He's 100 per cent pro-Reuther. The Cosmic Valley Chamber of Commerce thinks Reuther and the ADA crowd are dangerous Socialists. But now the Chamber crowd will have to work for Our Candidate or they won't get their national park. Wiley, who has been in politics for a long time, is betting they will support Our Candidate. More tomorrow.

Yours, Alex

Letter No. 3

DEAR ALBERT: Yesterday we visited a town whose principal factory has been closed down. Three hundred men out of the community's 3,000 are out of work. Roy Bowdoin, one of the newsmen travelling with us—his liberal colleagues call him Roy the Reactionary—said to me:

"You people like that, don't you? Your Candidate favors Federal aid to depressed areas. From his promises, people here expect that Uncle Sam will put up the money for them to induce factories from other parts of the country to locate here. Your Candidate wants these people to believe that if he is elected President, local people won't have to do one thing for themselves; the government will do everything. Your Candidate's chances depend upon how many there are of that kind of people."

What he was saying disturbed me. I didn't know how to answer him. He went on: "Did you ever hear of FDR's law?" I never had. Roy gave me the following explanation:

"FDR's law is that the New Deal has a vested interest in depression. Dr. Gallup opened FDR's eyes to the existence of this law. Polls showed that 80 per cent of all persons on WPA favored Roosevelt; on the other hand, outside the Solid South, a majority (or very close to a majority) of all persons who were self-sustaining were opposed to his continuation in office. Those on WPA did not hold it against the President that they could not find private employment, even after he had been eight years in office. They had been saturated with the propaganda that they owed a personal debt of gratitude to FDR for their relief checks. Therefore Roosevelt had nothing to fear from the unemployed. The potential majority against him lay among the self-sustaining.

"People who felt self-reliant tended to vote against the New Deal. To reduce the feeling of dependency upon government was to hurt New Deal chances.

"Truman won the election in 1948 only because his aides knew how to apply FDR's law. By a coup, the Democrats carried the grain belt, normally a Republican stronghold. They deliberately depressed the price of corn—refusing to buy a single bushel of corn during September and October. In November—after election—the government quickly bought 3,850,000 bushels.

"The engineered price collapse was blamed upon the Republican 80th Congress. The Democrats claimed in a 'surprise' announcement that the Republican Congress had not authorized the construction of sufficient storage capacity. The truth, as detailed by Senator John Williams (R.-Del.) after the election, was that the Department of Agriculture liquidated half of the 292 million bushel capacity before the shortage developed; 98 per cent of the warehouse space disposed of was sold by the Department of Agriculture before the 80th Congress changed the law.

"As prices collapsed, Truman screamed in his speeches to Midwest farmers: 'How many times do you have to be hit on the head before you find out what's hitting you?'

"The episode suggests one of the terrible dangers of a government managed economy. To win elections, the politicians can secretly plan to bribe or coerce or punish voting groups.

"Today—1960—the New Dealers running for office know all about FDR's law. The 1960 symbol: The Depressed Areas Bill. Notice how adroitly Your Candidate uses it in this city.

"The chances for this town's getting a bright new factory from Uncle Sam are next to nil. If the community is left to its own resources, it might do something for itself or the unemployed might go after jobs elsewhere. In either case, they become self-sustaining—and vote Republican. On the other hand if the Government promises to provide for them and solve all their problems for them, the area may remain depressed. Many of the working people will stay here—on relief and voting Democratic.

"From the New Deal point of view, the main thing is to make people look for help, not to themselves, but to the Federal government. Destroy self-reliance, self-responsibility, local responsibility. Breed a kind of dependency-type Americans who will be reliable New Deal voters.

"I close my lecture by pointing out Your Candidate's corollary to FDR's law: KEEP DEPRESSED AREAS DEPRESSED by discouraging self-help—making them think the government will do everything for them."

These talks with Roy aren't good for my peace of mind. I'll write you more over the week-end.

Yours, Alex

Letter No. 4

DEAR ALBERT: College was never like this. I'm getting a year's education every week. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

week's course of instruction came from a city of 50,000 called Morroville.

The Congressman from that district wants Uncle Sam to make a navigable stream out of Morroville Creek. The cost would be in the vicinity of $4.5 million. I'll use $4,370,000 because there are 437 congressional districts, and you will more quickly get the point of this discussion if you think of the cost of deepening Morroville Creek as being $10,000 per congressional district.

After the Congressman made his appeal to me to get his request through to the Candidate, I visited City Hall, the Chamber of Commerce and the local newspaper office asking questions. I found out, for one thing, that everybody is cynical about the alleged "benefits" if the creek is deepened. They all tell me that the expected use would consist of no more than the movement of a sand barge or two a week.

But this scandalous waste of $4,370,000 *doesn't kill anybody's enthusiasm. The civic boosters say: "So what? The contractor will spend a million or more of the* $4,370,000 *for local labor and locally-bought supplies. We want that million."*

When I suggested that Morroville voters have to pay Federal taxes, a CPA roared with laughter. He said, "Let me show you some tax arithmetic.

"The USA has 437 congressional districts. Since our congressional district is just an average district, it would pay 1/437 of the cost. That amounts to $10,000. Assume that the deepening program will be worth 10 cents on the dollar—ninety per cent of the cost being wasted.*

"At 10 cents on the dollar, the project is worth $437,000. But our congressional district's share of the Federal taxes necessary to pay for this project is only $10,000—to get something worth $437,000. The congressional district thus shows a gain of 437 per cent on the transaction—not counting the million spent in the district during construction."

I asked the CPA about maintenance.

He replied: "If this congressional district had to pay the cost of maintenance—$200,000 a year—this project would not be worth constructing even if the Rockefeller Foundation donated the entire original cost. But our Congressman says Uncle Sam will pay the maintenance and nearly all of that money will be spent in Morroville. The deal really looks terrific: all costs to be paid by Uncle Sam; all the income to go to the local community."

*Ten to twenty per cent of value is close to par for many Federal projects. In reclamation, government will often spend $1,500 an acre to irrigate land which will be worth only $200 or $300 an acre after irrigation! If Uncle Sam went into the open market and bought irrigated land to give away to farmers willing to accept these bribes, the taxpayers would save millions. But the graft, if that happened, would be too visible; even the enriched recipients would be outraged.

I told the story to Roy the Reactionary newsman. He said:

"Can't you see the con game angle? Accepting the CPA's arithmetic, even Morroville is swindled in the end. To get the necessary votes in Congress for $4,370,000 *for a project worth* 10 *cents on the dollar—worth less than nothing if maintenance costs are included—all other congressional districts must get something equivalent. The other* 436 *Congressmen aren't philanthropists, you know. But when all other congressional districts get equally wasteful expenditures, the country as a whole will be paying* 437 *times* $4,370,000 *for programs worth* 437 *times* $437,000. *Every district including Morroville will be swindled out of* 90 *per cent of the tax money spent. All that just to elect Con Men to Congress.*

"The Con Men get what they want: seats in Congress and prestige and power. Selfish short-sighted businessmen vote for a 100 per cent liberal-labor Congressman because he 'can get the most money from Washington for this district;' they become the unwitting agents of their own destruction."

I am learning fast. More next week.

Yours, Alex

Letter No. 5

DEAR ALBERT: The North Carolina tobacco region where our Grandfather Norman was born and where we have many relatives still on the farm taught me the a-b-c's of our farm problem. My conclusion is that this program is the Nation's biggest swindle—"have not" farmers being the tragic victims.

You well know that my sympathies have always been with the farmer. The surpluses bothered me, but not the principle of government help to the farmer. The reason for my sympathies is that the "poor relations" among our cousins, second cousins, and third cousins are farmers. Parenthetically, let me say, now that I've gotten around and visited our farming relatives, some of them are far from poor. Their net worth is much greater than that of many of our city cousins. But we do have poor kin; and some of them are located here in North Carolina.

The people I have talked to agree that in its early days, the support program benefited almost everybody in the tobacco region: growers, merchants and bankers, and property owners, both urban and rural.

But as you, Albert, with your economic inclinations, would point out, before long begins the operation of an ancient principle of economics: land values will rise to absorb all the extra profit created by government-guaranteed monopoly.

I talked to a second cousin of ours—Bart Joyner. He's a "have-not" farmer's son whose ambition is to own and operate a tobacco farm.

Fertile tobacco raising land could be bought in his county for $100 an acre. Bart wanted 10 acres and he had enough money in his savings account—$1,000—to make an all-cash purchase.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But Bart would not be allowed to raise tobacco on those fertile 10 acres; they did not have a tobacco allotment from the Federal government.

To be allowed to raise tobacco, he had two choices: he could buy from somebody else that farmer's Federal certificate to plant 10 acres in tobacco and then transfer the certificate to his own land or he could buy 10 acres already having such a certificate. In either case, his additional investment would be something like $2,000 an acre, $20,000 for 10 acres.

I had never before heard about "transferability." I was told that transferability (within the same county) of tobacco allotments is politically necessary because acreage restrictions over the years have reduced many farmers to the half-acre minimum—an unsatisfactory economic unit. Transferability keeps the half-acre growers satisfied; they know they can sell at a fat profit this "license to grow half-an-acre of tobacco" when it no longer pays them to grow it themselves.

Well, anyway, Bart had to borrow $20,000 to add to his saved-up $1,000. He got the additional funds by means of four loans:

From an older brother, George, living in Chicago —$3,000 at 5 per cent.

From Uncle Tom living in Los Angeles—$3,000 at 5 per cent.

From an insurance company in New York City—$4,000 on a 6 per cent first mortgage.

From the farmer who sold him the land, now retiring to St. Petersburg—$10,000 on a 7 per cent second mortgage.

Bart's first year's interest payment, $1,240; annual principal payments, $1,000.

I probably would not for a long time have recognized where this is all leading if I had not run into my newspaper friend again. Roy the Reactionary had been on tour with the other Candidates; now he was back. After I told him Bart's story, he sharply asked me: "Don't you see what's happening?"

I did not see, so he diagrammed it.

Bart's payments over the next 20 years, he pointed out, will be going, not to the tobacco region but to people in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York and St. Petersburg—who have thereby acquired a vested interest in the tobacco-support system.

Bart has mortgaged the next 20 years of his life to buy, not land, but his share in the beginning of a land monopoly-privilege system in the USA.

What is happening so tragically in tobacco is happening in lesser degree in other supported farm products. Con Men posing as the true friends of the poor are bringing to the USA the absentee landlordism found in the underdeveloped countries of Latin America and Asia—a condition which, say the same demagogs, can now be cured only by the lavish expenditure of American dollars.

Then the climax. My Reactionary friend reminded me that the farm subsidy system was invented by Communist planners who infiltrated the Department of Agriculture when Henry Wallace was Secretary. They planned better than they knew.

As you will recall, two weeks ago I wanted to quit. Now more than anything else, I want to stick through to the end. I want to see more of how this con game operates. More when I can find time.

Yours, Alex

Letter No. 6

DEAR ALBERT: I hope you heard the televised debate between the two Presidential candidates running in West Virginia.

I wonder whether the program had the same impact upon other viewers as it had upon me. My reaction—perhaps showing how much I've learned these past few weeks—was that no greater insult was ever offered to the people of West Virginia.

Among the thousands of words uttered by the two Candidates, there was no hint that the people of West Virginia are a self-reliant people, the kind that built America. The two men clearly thought the people of that state—or any other state—cannot and should not try to do something for themselves. The masses are incapable, helpless.

In effect, the two men were saying that the solution to every problem, personal or social, is to turn over the entire responsibility to Uncle Sam. Give him the money and the power. He will take care of everybody.

Maybe the people of West Virginia have slipped so far down the road of dependency that an appeal to good old American self-reliance would not carry that state. But I don't believe it. Yes, I will admit that some West Virginians—like in any state—are willing to become slaves in exchange for promised handouts; but you'll never convince me that a state with as great a heritage as West Virginia's has now bred a generation of weaklings.

Yours, Alex

P.S. My Reactionary friend has just handed me a little quotation: The government that is powerful enough to give everything to you is powerful enough to take everything from you.

More "Letters to Albert" will appear in HUMAN EVENTS next week.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of Part I: "CON MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE?" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol XVII, No. 23 — Section III **HUMAN EVENTS** June 9, 1960

Don't Pamper Other Nations

A Plea for a New US Foreign Policy

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By THE HON. STYLES BRIDGES
Senior Republican in the US Senate

THE ESSENCE of good government is the ability to foresee. For our future welfare the United States at this time must examine its position in the world community and re-evaluate the wisdom of many of our economic and political programs.

To a large degree many of our activities such as Lend-Lease, the Marshall Plan, Point Four and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements have been based upon the theory that internationalism was replacing national sovereignty. To promote the economic development, national security, education and social welfare of foreign nations, the American taxpayer has expended over $70 billion since 1945.

No rational person believes that the United States can afford to put a fence around this country and live in splendid isolation. The question we must now examine is whether our country can long continue to be the only internationally-minded nation in a world rampant with nationalism.

The facts indicate that instead of moving toward a harmonious concert among all nations the free world is more and more being divided into separate, autonomous and violently nationalistic units.

Of course the Communists believe in internationalism, but to them this merely means domination, control and the establishment of Soviet communism.

In Europe, France, West Germany, Belgium, The Netherlands, Italy and Spain are in the throes of a nationalistic revival. In the Middle East and North Africa the trend is more severe. In the Far East from India to Japan the resurgent nationalism is apparent. Africa seethes with the emergence of new nations—each seeking a place in the sun.

In our own hemisphere from Argentina to Cuba national sovereignty is the order of the day.

Despite our wishful thinking, therefore, the facts demonstrate that the world today is more nationalistic than at any time in modern history. This unpleasant conclusion suggests grave and serious implications for the United States and necessitates an immediate reappraisal of many of our present programs.

The effect of nationalism on the United States can be seen by an examination of the European Common Market.

Today Western Europe is a major industrial competitor of the United States. The war-ravaged economies have not only been restored, but actually are now growing at a faster rate than the US.

Our annual growth, for example, is calculated at 3 per cent, whereas West Germany is over 8 per cent, France almost 6 per cent and Italy over 5½ per cent. Significantly, the dollar reserves and the gold of Europe have increased from around $6 billion in 1949 to over $17½ billion in 1958; whereas during the same years, the gold stocks of the United States were reduced from approximately $24 billion to $20 billion.

Discriminatory tariffs and currency policies are in force against the US as well as against the fringe countries such as Great Britain and Scandinavia, which do not belong to the Common Market.

Considering that Western Europe has a population almost equal to the United States and at the present time is producing almost half as much industrial goods as this country, it seems obvious that we should re-appraise the wisdom of continued economic assistance.

We have a substantial deficit trade balance, Europe has a surplus; and yet we allow the discriminatory practices to continue, while at the same time we continue with military and economic aid.

In addition to these considerations, it must be emphasized that although Western Europe has 60 per cent as much capital available as does the United States, that area is keeping most of it at home and exporting only about $1.5 billion annually in comparison to our $3.75 billion.

Because of discriminatory practices against American products, we have seen a tremendous flight of American business into foreign countries. It is rather incongruous to observe one American automobile company build factories in Britain and then ship the product (which numbered around 70,000 units in 1959) to compete with American cars in our own domestic market.

Unfortunately, because of subsidies, favorable anti-trust laws, cheaper labor, etc., foreign investments are appearing more and more attractive to American capital.

Add this to Western Europe's high tariffs, the currency exchange restrictions and quota systems, and the out-and-out prohibitions against the entry of American goods in some countries and it becomes apparent that the situation, unless rectified, may eventually be intolerable for this Nation.

The impact upon our economy has certainly been felt already. Segments of the steel industry are undersold in their own manufacturing area. The same is true of pottery, textiles, plywood, tuna, sewing machines, typewriters, bicycles, automobiles, appliances and others.

Though the European Common Market offers the the best example, it is obvious that various other areas of the world have every intention of adopting similar procedures.

Both in Central America and in South America, organizational plans are now under way for the establishment of similar market agreements. Ironi-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cally enough, it appears that American capital is expected to finance these ventures.

The *economic* impact of these nationalistic trade policies upon the United States is in itself a serious problem for our consideration. Nevertheless, there are other ominous implications. *Nationalism by nature is always associated with anti-foreign sentiment.* As nationalism flourishes throughout the world, the United States has become the natural target for such anti-foreign sentiments.

Anti-American propaganda throughout the world has reached an all-time high.

These statements are serious but they can be completely documented by the facts.

AMERICANS who are concerned with the future of our Nation must attempt to project into the future the effect of programs which we witness today.

In my opinion, despite out-pourings of propaganda to the contrary, the growth of nationalism throughout the world will become more intense. As the economies of the various free nations become more developed, it appears as though more discriminatory practices will be aimed at the US.

I anticipate that unless changes are made, foreign industrial competition will greatly increase, not only in the world markets, but even more important, in our own domestic market.

We are in the midst of an economic war with the Soviet Union. In the days ahead this economic struggle will become more intense. As the economy of the Soviets becomes more capable of producing consumer goods, it is my anticipation that such materials will be dumped, regardless of the cost of them, in whatever areas such dumping will injure us to the greatest extent.

The present situation is serious, but not hopeless. No solution to these problems can be found by advocating a return to isolationism in this country. If for no other reason, our national defense requirements would make such a proposition absurd.

Obviously, however, more inflation, fiscal insolvency or severe depression will lead us to eventual bankruptcy and economic collapse.

It appears to me that the time has come to cease deluding ourselves as to the facts of life.

We are not living in an international-minded world. We are trying to be an internationally oriented nation in a world rampant with nationalism.

We are not taking care of our own self-interests. Unless we begin to do so, the day may come when we will have no interests left.

There are some very definite things which in my opinion should be done as soon as possible.

First, we must put our fiscal house in order, balance our Budget, eliminate waste, stop inflation and begin to make annual, periodic payments on our national debt.

Second, we must insist that those nations of the free world whose economies have now been restored assume a fair share of their responsibilities toward the under-developed nations. This activity is not one which can be carried exclusively by the American taxpayer.

Third, we must re-evaluate and revise our reciprocal trade programs to make them truly reciprocal instead of the one-way street which now exists. If discriminated against by our friends, we must institute appropriate counter-measures.

Fourth, we must adopt tax reforms and other incentives which will reduce the outflow of American business capital. American labor unions have a tremendous responsibility to reduce inefficiency, prevent unnecessary work stoppages, increase productivity (both in quantity and in quality), and restore the industrial reputation our nation formerly enjoyed throughout the world.

Fifth, we must bring the wage-price spiral under control. This consistently upward trend is helping to price us out of our foreign markets, and even places our domestic markets in jeopardy.

IT IS A HOPEFUL sign that for the first time American labor leaders in the textile, shoe, electronic and other industries are expressing concern about the trend toward foreign imports and the export or loss of American jobs.

Basically, it is my belief that many of the problems which we now face have been brought about by well-meaning but misguided people who have sincerely desired to spread the benefits of our civilization throughout the world. In their zeal to help, they have unwittingly, in many instances, led foreigners to believe that our resources are endless, that our bounty is not voluntary, but instead is our duty, and that as a nation we have none of the problems with which they are concerned.

As a consequence of all the foregoing, we seem impractical and unrealistic to other nations, and we have inspired very little confidence.

The time has come, therefore, for us to institute some changes. *We should treat the other free nations of the world as partners,* not as children to be pampered and financed!

We should be willing to accept our share of world responsibilities, but only in proportion to that which is equally shared by other nations.

Perhaps the entire situation can be best condensed by saying that we should be willing to be a friend and partner, but we must stop being dupes.

We cannot and should not try to return to isolationism, but we must safeguard our own self-interest by insisting that international programs be supported by the entire free world, not by us alone.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "DON'T PAMPER OTHER NATIONS" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED